

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 2, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 2, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, paragraphs 22 and 69 have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claims 6-9 and 12-15 have been amended to correct matters of form. Claims 1, 11 and 19 have been amended to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. New claims 20-24 have been added to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Support for the amendments to the claims and for the new claims can be found throughout the specification. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments and the new claims presented herein. The amendments have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits. Claims 2-3, and 16-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application.

The Examiner has objected to claims 6-10 and 12-19 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form and takes the position that multiple dependent claims cannot depend upon other multiple dependent claims. Applicants have amended claims 6-9, 12-15, and 19 to address the Examiner's concerns. Furthermore, Applicants have cancelled claims 16-18 without prejudice. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have cancelled claim 18 without prejudice. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-10 and 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. §112 fourth paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 6-9, 12-15, and 19 to address the Examiner's concerns. Furthermore, Applicants

have cancelled claims 16-18 without prejudice. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

Claims 1-3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) & (b) as being anticipated by G.B. Patent No. 2030400 A (“Hutchins”). Furthermore, claims 1, 3/1, 5/1, 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) & (b) as being anticipated by W.O. Patent No. 00/55648 (“Bednar”), and claims 1 – 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) & (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,437,175 (“Berni”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11 and 19 to include the limitation of “deriving a filter...by dividing a result of the calculus operation by the response of the other of the hydrophone and the accelerometer.” Applicants respectfully submit neither Hutchins, Bednar, nor Berni teaches the limitation of “deriving a filter...by dividing a result of the calculus operation by the response of the other of the hydrophone and the accelerometer,” as recited in claims 1, 11 and 19.

Hutchins describes a filter for determining vertical displacement of a body in water. (Abstract). Figure 2 of Hutchins illustrates a schematic for the filter. As is evident from the schematic of Figure 2 and the corresponding description, the filter 10 in Hutchins passes both a pressure signal and an acceleration signal through differentiation networks 22 and 24, then into a summing network 26 and a filter portion 28. However, Hutchins does not describe “deriving a filter...by dividing a result of the calculus operation by the response of the other of the hydrophone and the accelerometer.” In fact, Hutchins does not mention dividing any value with the response of a hydrophone or the response of an accelerometer, much less dividing a result of the calculus operation by the response of the other of the hydrophone and the accelerometer. Therefore, independent claims 1, 11, and 19 are patentable over Hutchins.

Bednar describes a filter coupled to a hydrophone for matching the frequency response of the hydrophone with that of an accelerometer. (Page 4, Line 28 – Page 5, Line 2). Together the hydrophone and the filter described in Bednar provide a circuit including differentiator and a pair of simple lags which are used to match the frequency response of the hydrophone with the frequency response of an accelerometer. (Page 7, Lines 3-4; Page 8, Lines 15-16). However, Bednar does not describe dividing a result

of the calculus operation by any value. Moreover, Bednar fails to describe “dividing the result of the calculus operation by the response of the other of the hydrophone and the accelerometer” as recited in claims 1, 11 and 19. Therefore, claims 1, 11, and 19 are also patentable over Bednar.

Berni describes a seismic data acquisition containing an accelerometer connected to an integrator. The output of the integrator is provided to a filter and the output of the filter and the output of a hydrophone are combined. However, Berni fails to even mention dividing a result of the calculus operation by any value. Berni only describes combining the output of the integrator and the hydrophone. Consequently, Berni also fails to teach “deriving a filter...by dividing a result of the calculus operation by the response of the other of the hydrophone and the accelerometer,” as recited in claims 1, 11 and 19. Therefore, claims 1, 11, and 19 are also patentable over Berni.

Claims 4-10, 12-15 and new claims 20-24 are also patentable over Hutchins, Bednar and Berni since they depend from claims 1, 11, and 19, respectively.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/

Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

PRAMUDJI WENDT & TRAN, LLP

1800 Bering, Suite 540

Houston, Texas 77057

Telephone: (713) 468-4600

Facsimile: (713) 980-9882

Attorney for Assignee